UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,583	10/06/2000	Mike G. Gyde	H0001641	1855

7590 10/05/2005	EXAMINER
Honeywell International Inc	NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

Honeywell International Inc
Law Department AB2
P O Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/680,583	GYDE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 July 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment, filed 07/19/2005.

2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 14 are independent

claims. In this amendment, no claim is canceled, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 12, and 14-16 are amended,

and no claim is added. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sinex (US 6,691,006) in view of Southgate (US 5,561,757).

As per claims 1 and 14, Sinex teaches a computer implemented method and

corresponding system for window management on a display, the display having a plurality of

windows, comprising the steps/means:

displaying a second window includes at least one checklist selection frame having a

layout and a list of available checklists (52 of fig. 3; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 5), and each of

the available checklists having at least one task (56 of fig. 3; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 5).

receiving a selection for a selected checklist from the list of available checklists (fig. 4;

col. 6, lines 17-32); storing the layout of the at least one checklist selection frame from which the

selected checklist is selected (layout of the display window 52 in figure 3 is inherently stored in the database system);

opening and displaying a third window containing a graphical overview of information related to said selected checklist, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist (e.g., fig. 14; col. 13, lines 12-17).

Sinex does not teach reducing the size of the second window to a reduced window and displaying the reduced window while displaying the third window. Southgate teaches in col. 3, lines 33-45 and in col. 8, lines 14-27 that overlapped windows are automatically resized in order for all the window can be fitted on the screen. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to implement the teaching from Southgate for reducing the size of the second window in Sinex's system since it would fit more windows in the same display area.

Modified Sinnex does not disclose displaying a first window on the display, simultaneously with the second window, wherein the first window includes a flight plan. However, simultaneously displaying multiple windows for displaying different type information is merely a designed choice and it is well known in the art. If Sinnex's system were implemented on a flying aircraft for displaying flight data, a flight plan would have been obviously displayed, simultaneously with other windows, on the display screen to display more information for a flying pilot. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include a flight plan window on the display screen in modified Sinex's system since it would have allowed the system to display different information on different area of the display screen.

As per claim 2, Sinex teaches the step of opening and displaying a third window

containing said graphical overview further comprises opening and displaying a synoptic frame

including a synoptic page (e.g., fig. 14; col. 13, lines 12-17).

As per claims 3, 13 and 16, Sinex teaches:

displaying the tasks of selected checklist (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32);

receiving an indication of a selected task from said selected checklist (e.g. selecting on

"revise" buttons 96 of fig. 4);

displaying in said synoptic frame a synoptic page associated with said selected task, at least

partially while said selected task is diplayed (col. 13, lines 11-51).

As per claim 4, Sinex teaches repeating said task selecting and synoptic page displaying

steps for each task in said checklist and restoring the stored frame layout (col. 13, lines 11-51).

As per claims 5 and 6, according to Sinex's system, window of fig. 3, for example, is a FMS

frame and a navigational frame.

As per claim 7, Sinex teaches the selected checklist includes a plurality of tasks, and further

comprising the steps of:

displaying at least one task of the plurality of tasks (e.g., fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32);

selecting a particular displayed task (e.g. selecting on *"revise"* buttons 96 of fig. 4);

determining if a fourth window containing a graphical overview of information that is

associated with said selected task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a

checklist (col. 13, lines 11-51); and

repeating said displaying and determining steps until the end of the checklist is reached

(repeating the above steps until the end of checklist task in fig. 4).

As per claims 8 and 10, Sinex teaches a method of window management on a display device

for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32), said method comprising

the steps of:

listing at least one of the plurality of tasks in the checklist in a second window on the first

display (fig. 4);

receiving a selection for a selected task of the listed at least one task (e.g. selecting on

"*revise*" buttons 96 of fig. 4);

determining whether a synoptic window containing a graphical overview of information that

is associated with said task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a

checklist and storing the frame layout of the first display in memory (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-

51).

Sinex does not teach reducing the size of the first window to a reduced window and

displaying the reduced window. However, Southgate teaches that in col. 3, lines 33-45 and in

col. 8, lines 14-27. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use

the teaching from Southgate of reducing the size of the first window in modified Sinex's system

since it would fit more windows in the same display area;

Sinex further teaches displaying the synoptic window associated with said task while the reduced window is displayed (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-51);

repeating said listing, determining, and displaying steps for each said task of the plurality of tasks in the checklist (repeating the above steps until the end of checklist task in fig. 4).

Modified Sinnex does not disclose displaying a first window on the display, simultaneously with the second window, wherein the first window includes a flight plan. However, simultaneously displaying multiple windows for displaying different type information is merely a designed choice and it is well known in the art. If Sinnex's system were implemented on a flying aircraft for displaying flight data, a flight plan would have been obviously displayed, simultaneously with other windows, on the display screen to display more information for a flying pilot. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include a flight plan window on the display screen in modified Sinex's system since it would have allowed the system to display different information on different area of the display screen.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Sinex teaches storing the first page layout prior to said second page displaying step (col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 37; frame 50 of fig. 3 is stored before frame 80 fig. 4 is displayed).

As per claim 12, it recites a combination of limitations recited in claims 1 and 2; therefore it is rejected as set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 2, combined.

As per claims 15 and 17, Sinex teaches displaying the associated graphical overview includes the step of displaying a diagram (e.g. fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-51).

5. Because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of Official Notice, the common knowledge in the art statement in the last Office Action is taken to be admitted prior art.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinex in view of Southgate and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Sinex does not disclose determining that the end of the checklist has been reached; determining that a frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring said stored frame layout. The above features are taught by applicant's admitted prior art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include determining that the end of a checklist has been reached; determining that a previous frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring the previous stored frame layout in Sinex's system since it would have made the process of restoring previous stored frame layout faster.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 12, and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Inquiries

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-

4139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571)272-4847. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/680,583   Page 9
Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
September 29, 2005

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100